

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This communication is responsive to Office Action of October 5, 2004 in which the following objections were raised: [1] The specification was objected to by the Examiner. Appropriate correction was required; [2-3] Claims 24, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikari et al. (U.S. Patent 5,993,186); [4-5] Claims 1-3, 8-16 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikari et al. (U.S. Patent 5,993,186) in view of Nayar (U.S. Patent 6,118,474), and further in view of NakaMats (U.S. Patent 4,993,822); [6] Claims 4-7 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikari et al. in view of Nayar in view of NakaMats as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Takemoto et al. (U.S. Patent 4,332,740); [7] Claims 26, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikari et al. as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Nayar (U.S. Patent 6,118,474), and further in view of NakaMats (U.S. Patent 4,993,822); and [8-9] Claim 25 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has amended Claims 1-8 and 14-21 and canceled Claims 9-13 and 22-30.

1. THE SPECIFICATION OBJECTED:

The specification was objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant has amended the specification.

2-3. CLAIMS 24, 27 and 28 REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Claims 24, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ikari et al. (U.S. Patent 5,993,186).

Applicant has canceled Claims 24, 27 and 28.

4-5. CLAIMS 1-3, 8-16 AND 21-23 REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1-3, 8-16 and 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikari et al. (U.S. Patent 5,993,186) in view of Nayar (U.S. Patent 6,118,474), and further in view of NakaMats (U.S. Patent 4,993,822).

Ikari

The Examiner has characterized the Ikari reference as teaching a *“first reflector ...rotatable about the optical axis...and a...second reflector...configured for rotation about the optical axis”* (Office Action of 10-05-04 at page 2). The Applicant respectfully rejects this characterization of the Ikari reference.

The Ikari reference teaches a photographic development system for digitally re-rendering a set of still images by projection of a individual frames of a roll of photographic film onto a digital input. There is no teaching in the Ikari reference directed to varying the field of view of a camera which is the subject of the Applicant's amended Independent Claims 1 and 14 and Claims dependent thereon. Even assuming arguendo that the Ikari reference was relevant art based perhaps on the presence of two mirrors 137A-B shown in Ikari FIG. 18 it remains the case that neither mirror changes a field of view, neither mirror rotates around either the optical axis 139C of the source, i.e. the projected light from the roll of film, or the optical axis 139A of the sink, and neither mirror rotates concentrically with the other about a common optical axis, all of which are limitations found in the Applicants amended Independent Claims 1 and 14 and Claims dependant thereon.

Nayar

The Examiner has characterized the Nayar reference and specifically FIG. 21 thereof as teaching a mirror with a curved surface in the optical path of a camera and the Applicant concurs with this characterization, to the limited extent stated. However, as with the above discussed reference, none of limitations of the Applicant's amended Independent Claims 1 and 14 and by extension remaining claims dependent thereon is found in the Nayar reference. Mirror 2135 (Nayar FIG. 21) is not tiltable; neither mirror 2116 (Nayar FIG. 21) nor mirror 2135 is rotatable about the optical axis of the camera, and there is no mechanism for changing the field of view. Elsewhere in the Nayar specification a single movable mirror is

disclosed but, the movement is limited and carefully proscribed in keeping with Nayar's stated objective which is to avoid the "*serious drawbacks ...associated with a device having critical moving parts*" (Nayar at col. 1 lines 43-47).

NakaMats

The Examiner has characterized the NakaMats reference as teaching a "*mirror having a first plane surface and a second curved surface...*" (Office Action of 10-05-04 at page 5). The Applicant concurs with that characterization but respectfully rejects the purported combinability of the reference with the above referenced art.

The Nayar reference teaches a reflective lamp shade which can be manually tilted to direct projected light, which in the case of the cited FIG. 53 is a strobe light, to a wall or a book. There is no teaching in the Nayar reference directed to varying the field of view of a camera which is the subject of the Applicant's amended Independent Claims 1 and 14 and Claims dependent thereon.

The Applicant respectfully submits, for the reasons discussed above, that none of the references singly or in combination include the limitations found in the Applicant's amended Independent Claims 1 and 14. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

6. CLAIMS 4-7 AND 17-20 REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 4-7 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikari et al. in view of Nayar in view of NakaMats as applied to claims 1 and 14 above, and further in view of Takemoto et al. (U.S. Patent 4,332,740). The Examiner has characterized the Takemoto reference as disclosing a red and blue partially reflecting mirrors and the Applicant agrees with that characterization to the limited extent stated herein. The Applicant however respectfully rejects the applicability of the Takemoto reference.

The Takemoto reference shows four fixed mirrors providing input to and integrated with an optical semiconductor chip. Aside from the obvious difficulties in combining the reference based on field of use or technology it remains the fact that all mirrors are fixed and thus do not vary a field of view or alter any other optical characteristic of the input to the semiconductor chip. The Applicant respectfully submits, for the reasons discussed above, that none of the references singly or in combination include the limitations found in the Applicant's amended Independent Claims 1 and 14. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

7. CLAIMS 26, 29 AND 30 REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 26, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikari et al. as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Nayar (U.S. Patent 6,118,474), and further in view of NakaMats (U.S. Patent 4,993,822).

Applicant has canceled Claims 26, 29 and 30.

8-9. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

Claim 25 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant has canceled Claim 25.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks, and the amendments to the Claims, Applicant respectfully submits that all remaining Claims 1-8 and 14-21 have been placed in a condition for allowance, and requests that they be allowed. Early notice to this effect is solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, including petition fees and extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1338 (Docket No. STGUP006).

Respectfully submitted,

IP CREATORS



Charles C. Cary

Registration No. 36,764

Date: April 5, 2005

P.O. Box 2789
Cupertino, CA 95015
Tel: (408) 850-9585
Fax: (408) 850-9585
E-mail: cccary@ipcreators.com